

DRAFT

REMARKS

Please cancel Claims 1-4, 6-7, 15-17, 21, 23-26, 28-40 and 42-43. Claims 8-11 and 13 are pending.

103 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 8-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Bendinelli et al. ("Bendinelli;" U.S. Patent No. 6,061,719) in view of Moraes (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,502). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 8-11 and 13 is not shown or suggested by Bendinelli and Moraes, alone or in combination.

In the instant Office Action (page 5, line 6, of the Office Action), the Examiner states only that Claim 8 is rejected with the same rationale as Claim 1. However, Claim 8 includes limitations that are different from, and in addition to, the limitations of Claim 1 (or any other claim). (Claim 1 is canceled in this response. The Examiner is respectfully directed to the response just prior to this one for the text of Claim 1.) Independent Claim 8 recites an embodiment of the present invention in which a channel number is sent over the Internet from a set top box to a server computer system, and based on that channel number the server computer system returns a set of Uniform Resource Locators (URLs).

Specifically, independent Claim 8 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a method that includes "receiving information at said server computer system via the Internet, said information comprising a channel number that identifies program content that is being received by at a television from a

CSCO-70364/JPH/WAZ
Examiner: KE, P.

4

Serial No.: 09/742,551
Group Art Unit: 2174

DRAFT

broadcaster, said channel number identified by a set top box coupled to said television and to the Internet, said channel number sent to said server computer system from said set top box" and "identifying at said server computer system a set of URLs for Web sites associated with said channel number."

Applicants respectfully submit that these limitations are not shown or suggested by either Bendinelli or Moraes, or the combination thereof, and that Claim 8 is in condition for allowance. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bendinelli nor Moraes, nor the combination thereof, show or suggest sending a channel number over the Internet from a set top box to a server computer system, where based on that channel number the server computer system returns a set of URLs. Also, Applicants respectfully submit that Bendinelli and Moraes, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 9-11 and 13 dependent on Claim 8, and that these claims are in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 8-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 8-11 and 13 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

CSCO-70364/JPH/WAZ
Examiner: KE, P.

5

Serial No.: 09/742,551
Group Art Unit: 2174

DRAFT

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: _____

William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060

CSCO-70364/JPH/WAZ
Examiner: KE, P.

6

Serial No.: 09/742,551
Group Art Unit: 2174